

FINAL COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

March 1, 2019

**RPD 20-24 Consultative
Committee**





Regent Policy Document Consultative Committee 20-24

Committee Members

John Blakeman

*Professor/Department Chair –
Political Science
College of Letters and Science*

Jennifer Collins

*Professor – Political Science;
Chair, Faculty Council (2018-19)
College of Letters and Science*

Lucy DeLain

*Speaker of the Senate
Student Government Association*

Dyllan Griepentrog

*Student Body Vice President
Student Government Association*

Nerissa Nelson

*Professor – University Library
University College*

Holly Schmies

*Associate Professor – Athletic Training
School of Health Care Professions
College of Professional Studies*

Wayne Sorenson

*Director, Continuing Education
and Outreach*

Rebecca Stephens

*Professor/Department Chair – English
College of Letters and Science*

Mark Tolstedt

*Professor – Communication
Chair, Consultative Committee
College of Fine Arts and Communication*

Mick Veum

*Professor – Physics & Astronomy
College of Letters and Science*

Les Werner

*Professor/Discipline Coordinator – Forestry
College of Natural Resources*

Annie Wetter

*Professor - Nutrition
School of Health Promotion and
Human Development
College of Professional Studies*

Rebecca Wisniewski

*LSA Advanced - Inter-Library Loan
University Library
University College*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
Introduction and Background	8
Consideration of Individual Programs	9
Concluding Comments and Recommendations	22
Committee Recommendation to Regents	27
Appendices	
Point Forward – March 5, 2018 release – Appendix A	
Point Forward – November 12, 2018 release – Appendix B	
Board of Regents Policy Document 20-24 and UWSP Policy – Appendix C	
WI State Statute Removal from Chpt.36 and Education Committee – Appendix D	
Huron Consulting Group Report – Appendix E	
Comparison of staffing load – Appendix F	
Cost per Major – Appendix G	
Retention rate by Major – Appendix H	
Graduating majors and Initial majors – Appendix I	
UWSP – Mission and Vision Statements – Appendix J	
UWSP Dept of Art & Design - Response to Point Forward – Appendix K	
UWSP Dept of Geography & Geology - Response to Point Forward – Appendix L	
UWSP Dept of History - Response to Point Forward – Appendix M	
Committee Questions to Administration, UW System Legal, Departments – Appendix N	
AFT-Wisconsin Legal Opinion – Appendix O	
UWSP Chancellor Letter - French and German majors – Appendix P	
UWSP Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness – Appendix Q	
UWSP Chancellor Letter - RPD 20-24- Appendix R	
UW System Administrative Code 102- Appendix S	
UWSP Academic Affairs Committee – CounterPoint – Appendix T	
UWSP Student Government Association – Response to Point Forward - Appendix U	
UWSP Program/Unit Discontinuance Consultative Committee- Final Report – Appendix V	

Executive Summary

The Consultative Committee convened November 19, 2018, in response to the Point Forward proposal released November 12, 2018, to discontinue targeted academic programs resulting in the potential layoff of tenured faculty members. The formation of this committee is in accordance with Regent Policy Document (RPD) 20-24 (UWSP 5.04, E & F), which includes the charge to the committee (Appendix C).

Committee Charge

The charge specifies that “[t]he Consultative Committee shall request and review comments and recommendations on the proposed program discontinuance from faculty and academic and university staff in the program, faculty and academic and university staff in the affected college or school, students in the program, and other appropriate institutional bodies or individuals” to review and evaluate the proposal, then prepare a recommendation to the Chancellor, and subsequently to the Board of Regents. Significantly, the charge states that the “Consultative Committee shall review and evaluate any proposal to discontinue a program that will lead to faculty layoff.” This work was to be completed within 90 days immediately following the proposal’s submission to UWSP’s Common Council.

Process

During the mandated three-month period, the Consultative Committee met bi-weekly in order to examine the grounds upon which particular programs had been proposed for elimination and to evaluate the merits of each proposal. Our review and evaluation process encompassed the following steps. The Committee:

- 1) Reviewed the charge (RPD 20-24), Point Forward, and set goals, a timeline, and procedures.
- 2) Met with key stakeholders from each identified program in Point Forward to provide current and historical data based on the considerations stated in UWSP 5.04 section E.
 - The deans of the College of Letters and Science and the College of Fine Arts and Communication, the two colleges with programs targeted for elimination.
 - The chairs, faculty and staff of the targeted departments: History, Geography/Geology, Art and Design, and World Languages.
- 3) Reviewed and discussed written responses from each identified department in Point Forward to the proposed elimination of their programs.
- 4) Requested additional information from administration, UW System Legal, and other sources when needed.
- 5) Analyzed data contained in Point Forward and the Huron Report; data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE) and the departments earmarked for elimination, and data gathered from outside sources (*Note: Huron is a global consultancy firm that works with higher education institutions and was hired by UW System to gather data for UWSP*).
- 6) Reported progress to the Student Government Association (SGA) General Assembly meetings via our student committee members.
- 7) Formed a set of criteria based on our findings and created a rubric to evaluate each identified program in Point Forward.
- 8) Voted on each program based on the rubric.
- 9) Drafted the final report.

Data Evaluation

It became clear during this process that the data provided in Point Forward was in parts incomplete and in parts inconsistent with the data from other sources, such as the departments and the university's own Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

Point Forward lists five criteria for selecting the program(s) proposed for elimination (p.7). The five criteria (summarized) are:

- 1) Current enrollment**
- 2) Ability to attract new students**
- 3) Retention**
- 4) Student Credit Hour (SCH) generated**
- 5) Cost per SCH**

The Committee found that these expressed criteria were applied inconsistently across the various programs included in the proposal for elimination. For example, a major with an average of six students and one with 120 students were both labelled "low-enrollment" majors.

Likewise, the Point Forward proposal presented each program in isolation without comparative data on other programs on campus, rendering it difficult to evaluate considerations like *"Whether the work done in the program complements that done in another essential program,"* and *"Whether the work done in the program duplicates academic instruction and course content delivered in other programs at the institution,"* especially when Point Forward data were inconsistent with OIRE data or data provided by Huron Consulting (Appendices B, Q, E).

Ultimately, the Committee concluded that these data deficiencies made it impossible to undertake a fair evaluation and rational decision process regarding the considerations outlined in Point Forward; the data simply did not permit comparison of targeted programs with other programs on campus by the five criteria listed above. To address this inconsistency, the Committee made multiple requests of the Administration for the missing data, methodologies, sources of data, and clarification (Appendix N). Similar to the data in Point Forward, the Administration's responses to the Committee's information requests were incomplete relative to our stated mission, redirected the Committee to another administrator, or ultimately, were left unanswered. Criteria such as *"Current and predicted comparative cost analysis/effectiveness of the program"* or *"Student and market demand and projected enrollment in the subject matter taught in the program"* also could not be evaluated without market research or predictive forecasts; neither type of data was included with the Point Forward proposal.

Criteria Analysis and Compliance Matrix

The data deficiencies impacted the Committee's ability to evaluate the program proposals based on both the criteria included in Point Forward, and the criteria mandated by RPD 20-24 (Table 1).

With respect to the criteria mandated by RPD 20-24, per the UWSP Handbook (Chapter 4A, Section 2, Chapter UWSP 5.04), "degree granting programs may be eliminated if the educational mission of the University will be enhanced by its discontinuation" (i.e. educational considerations; UWSP, 5.04, Section A). The policy further stipulates that a proposal to discontinue programs shall reflect information and analysis regarding educational, programmatic, and/or financial considerations (UWSP, 5.04, Section C). The Committee therefore analyzed the

educational, programmatic, and financial considerations of program discontinuance based on the seven criteria as follows (UWSP, 5.04, Section E):

1. **The centrality of the program to the institution's mission.**
2. **The academic strength and quality of the program and of its faculty.**
3. **Complementary programming.**
4. **Duplicative programming.**
5. **Student and market demand/projected enrollment for the content in the program.**
6. **Comparative cost analyses/effectiveness of the program.**
7. **Program assessment reports.**

In order to comply with the UWSP University Handbook's guidelines, a proposal to discontinue a program must provide evidentiary information and analysis regarding each of these criteria (evidentiary compliance). Table 1 below summarizes Point Forward's evidentiary compliance by including:

1. **RPD 20-24's educational, programmatic, and financial considerations.**
2. **The Committee's evaluation of the impact of program discontinuance.**
3. **Point Forward's stated criteria for program discontinuance: current enrollment, ability to attract new students, retention, Student Credit Hour (SCH) generated, and cost per SCH.**

The Committee used these criteria as the basis for creating a matrix of data points for each program proposed for discontinuance in Point Forward. This matrix laid out whether the available data for each program provided evidence for each of the criteria specified in both Point Forward and RPD 20-24. For example, as illustrated in Table 1, Art 2D met Point Forward criteria #2 (retention) but did not meet RPD 20-24 criteria #2 (programmatic considerations). The Committee used this compliance matrix for each individual program to clearly justify the Committee's rationale and recommendation based on this metric.

Table 1. Compliance matrix for program discontinuation based on criteria set forth in Point Forward and RPD 20-24 (see UWSP Handbook, Chapter 4A, Section 2, Chapter UWSP 5.04).

Academic Program	Point Forward Criteria*					RPD 20-24 Criteria**		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
Art 2-D and 3-D	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Geoscience	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Geography	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
History	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
<p><i>* Point Forward Criteria (Point Forward, page 7)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current enrollment 2. Ability to attract new students 3. Retention 4. Student Credit Hour (SCH) generated 5. Cost per SCH <p><i>** RPD 20-24 Criteria (UWSP 5.04, Section C)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educational considerations 2. Programmatic considerations 3. Financial considerations 								

Committee Recommendation

Based on our analysis and evaluation as described above, the Committee voted unanimously on February 19, 2019, to oppose the proposed elimination of the programs identified in Point Forward – Art: 2-Dimensional Emphasis (B.F.A.) and Art: 3-Dimensional Emphasis (B.F.A.), Geoscience (all emphases within the B.S. major), Geography (all emphases within the B.S. major), and History (all emphases within the B.A. and B.S. major). (Please note Appendix P regarding the French and German majors.)

The Committee agreed that the current or proposed changes within and to the targeted programs, as detailed by the department chairs, faculty, and deans of the affected colleges, positively addressed concerns expressed in Point Forward.

While the committee fully recognizes UWSP's financial predicament and appreciates the need to cut costs in a prudent and responsible manner, the Committee did not find sufficient financial, educational, or programmatic justification for the elimination of these programs identified in Point Forward.

We outline our justification and rationale for each program decision in the *Consideration of Individual Programs* section.

Introduction and Background

In compliance with RPD 20-24, Point Forward, released November 12, 2018, proposed to discontinue six low-enrolled UWSP programs, resulting in the possible layoff of tenured faculty. As required by this policy, UWSP's Common Council formed and convened a Consultative Committee on November 19, 2018, to consider and review these proposals and to make recommendations to the Chancellor within a three-month timeframe.

The legal foundations applicable to the Point Forward proposal were recently established. UWSP is the first campus to invoke this policy anywhere within the UW System.

May 29, 2015 - Wisconsin's Joint Finance Committee approved (12-4) to remove statute 36.13, Wis Stats. – the provision regarding tenure – from Chapter 36 (Appendix D).

June 4, 2015 - the Education Committee approved (4-3) an amended resolution to move language concerning tenure into Regent policy. Essentially, shared governance language stayed in state statute while faculty tenure practices were removed and placed in the Board of Regents policy (Appendix D).

March 10, 2016 - UW System Board of Regents (BOR) created RPD 20-24 – “Procedures relating to financial emergency or program discontinuance requiring faculty layoff and termination.” RPD 20-24 states that chancellors at each UW campus, with the advice and counsel of their faculty, are responsible for the implementation of RPD 20-24 (Appendix C).

Programs discontinued that do not result in tenured faculty layoffs follow a different procedure outlined in UW System Administrative Policy 102, Section 3.4. (Appendix S).

On March 5, 2018, the Chancellor released the first version of Point Forward where 13 programs were slated for elimination. This announcement created a strong reaction from faculty, staff, and students (as well as people outside of the campus community) who saw this as a lack of commitment to a liberal arts education, a change to the university's mission and identity, and an opportunity to lay off faculty under new rules to weaken tenure. Administration saw this proposal as a path to regain enrollment and provide new opportunities for students. In response, several governance groups and other ad hoc committees provided recommendations and alternatives for the Administration to consider. These groups met between April 2018 – November 2018 and included the following:

- Academic Affairs Committee – CounterPoint (Appendix T)
- Student Government Association – A Response to the Point Forward Proposal (Appendix U)
- Program and/or Unit Discontinuance Consultative Committee (PUDCC) – Response to Point Forward (Appendix V)
- Academic and Budget Advisory Work Group (advisory group to the Provost)

When the Academic and Budget Advisory Work Group completed its work in mid-November, the second version of Point Forward was released on November 12, 2018 (referred to as “Point Forward” hereafter). The Consultative Committee was convened shortly thereafter. Initially, the Committee operated without authority as the local RPD 20-24 policy was not ratified by the Board of Regents until December 2018. After the ratification, the Committee reviewed its charge and focused its analysis on information gathered from key stakeholders and information requested from administration and other sources.

This report presents the findings and recommendations of the Committee related to the proposed elimination of academic programs in Point Forward and to the process of applying RPD 20-24.

Consideration of Individual Programs

Art: 2-Dimensional Emphasis (B.F.A.) and Art: 3-Dimensional Emphasis (B.F.A.)

Point Forward proposed discontinuing Art: 2-Dimensional Emphasis (B.F.A.); Art: 3-Dimensional Emphasis (B.F.A.). The Committee evaluated the proposed elimination based on criteria set forth in Point Forward and UWSP RPD 20-24 policy (Table 2).

After reviewing the evidence, the Committee voted unanimously against the motion to discontinue the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree programs in 2-Dimensional and 3-Dimensional Art (0-11-0). This decision was reached based on the following:

1. The Committee unanimously agreed that the Point Forward proposal failed to provide the requisite educational, programmatic, or financial evidence, as detailed in UWSP's RPD 20-24 policy, to support the elimination of degree granting programs in Art. Specifically,
 - Point Forward did not provide evidence that terminating these programs would enhance the educational mission of the university (educational consideration).
 - Point Forward did not include results of an analysis exploring the potential impact termination would have on other academic programs, departments, or colleges (programmatic consideration)
 - Point Forward did not provide results from benefit-cost, financial impact, or cost minimization analyses to justify program termination (financial consideration).

Table 2. Compliance matrix for discontinuation of the Bachelor of Fine Arts (2-D and 3-D) based on criteria set forth in Point Forward and UWSP RPD 20-24.

Academic Program	Point Forward Criteria*					RPD 20-24 Criteria**		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
Art 2-D and 3-D	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
<i>* Point Forward Criteria (Point Forward, page 7)</i> 1. Current enrollment 2. Ability to attract new students 3. Retention 4. Student Credit Hour (SCH) generated 5. Cost per SCH <i>** RPD 20-24 Criteria (UWSP 5.04, Section C)</i> 1. Educational considerations 2. Programmatic considerations. 3. Financial considerations								

2. The lack of data for enrollment, retention, student credit hour (SCH) generation, and cost per SCH for all programs on campus compromised the Committee's ability to make meaningful comparisons between the programs targeted for discontinuation and those that would be retained. Additionally, the lack of information regarding the source of the data presented in Point Forward and the methodologies associated with calculated values created doubt as to the reliability of the evidence offered in Point Forward.
3. The Committee found that the Chancellor's proposal to terminate the degree programs in Art did not uniformly address the evaluation criteria set forth in the Point Forward proposal. Specifically, the proposal failed to provide evidence detailing student retention rates and the SCH generated by these programs (Table 2).
4. The Committee found the data provided in the Point Forward proposal regarding student enrollment/recruitment (Table 3) did not align with other sources of information (Table 4). Although differences are small, it is not clear why there are any discrepancies in student enrollment data.

Table 3. Four-year (2013-2017) student recruitment/enrollment data for Art programs as cited in Point Forward.

Emphasis	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
ART HI-BA	1			
ART2D-BFA	12	9	13	12
ART3D-BFA	3	3	5	1
ART-BA	12	6	7	4
ART-BFA	1			
ARTGR-BFA	34	28	23	36

Table 4. Four-year (2013-2017) OIRE data for new and transfer student recruitment into Art programs.

DEPARTMENT	Description	Major\Emph	Entrance	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Art and Design	Art (BA)	ART-BA\ART-HIST	New				1	1
			Trn	1				
		ART-BA\STUDIO-ART	New	10	3	5	3	1
			Trn	2	3	4	1	4
	Art (BFA)	ART-BFA\	New			1		
			Trn	1				
		ART-BFA\2D	New	5	7	12	8	9
			Trn	6	2	3	2	4
		ART-BFA\3D	New	2	2	3	2	2
			Trn	1	1	2	1	1
		ART-BFA\GR-DESIGN	New	27	22	17	26	30
			Trn	7	7	6	10	10
Art and Design Total				62	47	53	54	62

5. The Committee found the data provided in Point Forward regarding cost per SCH and the total cost of education for these degree options were not accurate owing to changes in staffing and consolidation of program offerings.
- Loss of staff. The Huron data did not include the recent loss and non-replacement of five staff members, four of whom are faculty members. This means the cost of earning the degree is inaccurate. When the original Point Forward document was released on March 5, 2018, two faculty took VSIP (Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments) offers. In 2015, the Department had 28 faculty and staff including adjuncts with about 22 FTE teaching. In 2017-18, that number dropped to 18 faculty and staff with 14 FTE teaching. Currently, the Department has 12 faculty and staff and 9.5 FTE teaching (this does not include 2 faculty on Wausau and Marshfield campus). Since the data provided in Point Forward stops at 2017, the rapid attrition of faculty is not fully represented. It should be noted that the current number of faculty are now delivering the programming for the same degree.
 - Course staffing distribution. This is a high cost program, but faculty teaching 2D and 3D courses also teach foundational courses, which are essential to the programs Point Forward proposes to retain.
 - Efficiencies identified. Enacted changes to the structure and offering of foundation courses has produced efficiencies (\$/SCH) that are not reflected in the Point Forward proposal. The Department has proposed further changes that will result in additional efficiencies and reductions in the cost per SCH, including a B.F.A. in studio art that requires no new staffing while still accommodating the B.A. in studio art. According to the Dean of the College of Fine Arts and Communication, and the Chair of Art and Design, both the ART-B.F.A. and the ART-B.A. require the same staffing. This contrasts with what the Administration has stated that there would need to be three to four new faculty to have the studio emphases B.F.A.s.
 - Recent program revisions. Art and Design recently went through internal restructuring and revision of its programs. It elevated the graphic design degree, and the Department looked for ways to become more efficient. After a thorough examination and review, and difficult discussions, the faculty agreed to change from a 3/3 course load to 4/4. This change reduced studio hours, but still met the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditation requirement. Faculty are currently working on a curriculum pathway, increased recruitment, and exploring the potential for Art and Design to build relationships and collaborations, such as with graphic design and theatre design. This would allow art students to take studios in these other disciplines without increasing staffing. None of these revisions, however, are reflected in the Point Forward proposal.
6. The Committee found Point Forward lacking in its assessment of the impact that termination will have on other programs, departments, and colleges.
- School of Design proposal: In the School of Design proposed as part of Point Forward, Art and Design students are required to take four foundational studio courses for graphic design. Eliminating another studio faculty member in addition to those already lost means that there will not be enough faculty to support the new School of Design's course requirements--in Art and other areas.
 - Recruitment and retention: The loss of the professional B.F.A. degree, which is a standard in the field of studio art, will cause students to look elsewhere for the professional degree, exacerbating the rate of transfers.
 - Staffing reductions. Point Forward asserts that "the proposed elimination will result in less need for both upper level 2D and 3D courses" leading to "a reduction in at least one tenured studio faculty member outside of graphic design." The implication is that the courses for the two B.F.A. studio

emphases are taught by different people, suggesting that if one emphasis is eliminated then there will necessarily be less need for faculty. However, according to the Chair of the Department, the major emphases are intertwined and share faculty resources, and eliminating one emphasis does not open a faculty line.

- Accreditation. UWSP College of Fine Arts and Communication has earned national distinction as one of only 30 (of more than 4,600) colleges/universities in the country to hold national accreditation in all four arts disciplines: Art & Design (NASAD), Dance (NASD), Music (NASM), and Theatre (NAST). Of the 26 UW two and four-year campuses, only 6 have national accreditation in Art & Design with NASAD. Eliminating the B.F.A. will mean that UWSP will no longer have all four accreditations.
- Enrollment declines. When the original Point Forward document was first released in March 5, 2018, many negative articles appeared in state and national publications. This had a corresponding negative impact on the Department's enrollment for potential students seeking a B.F.A. when they realized the campus may not offer that program. The Department chair cites the proposed elimination of the art program, bad press, and word of mouth about the program's potential instability as the cause for this enrollment drop.

7. The Committee noted that Point Forward failed to demonstrate the financial benefits associated with terminating these programs.

- Lost revenue. Point Forward does not include the cost of lost enrollment. The Department Chair said the number of new Art and Design students went from an average of 40 to 8 in 2018. The cost to the university would then be \$214,400 annually, assuming a rate of \$6,700 per student per academic year.
- Savings vs. lost revenue. If the program were eliminated resulting in 8 additional students leaving the university, this would equate to \$53,600, per year. Dropping the program and eliminating a faculty member would save the university \$10,939 (based on the average faculty salary in the College of Fine Arts and Communication). Considering the magnitude of the budget deficit, which is estimated at \$8 million over the next three years, this does not contribute significantly to reducing it.

8. The Committee concluded that discontinuing the degree offerings in Art did not enhance the educational mission of the university.

- Recruitment: Eliminating the B.F.A. option limits recruitment and retention of Art students and thus the growth potential of the new School of Design. Eliminating a faculty member will leave essential courses uncovered and thus reduce the quality of education for students in any remaining programs.
- Mission: While Point Forward states a new vision for the campus, the current educational mission of our campus has not changed, and eliminating the B.F.A. would not enhance that mission, and, in fact, would take away from it.

The decision to discontinue the B.F.A. studio art program does not appear to be a pedagogically sound or strategic move. Point Forward proposes that UWSP's educational mission moving forward will be to focus on professional degree programs, which the B.F.A. is standard for the discipline. Elimination of the B.F.A. would remove the professional degree option for the discipline and directly contradict the educational mission.

Geoscience Major (B.S. - all emphases); Geography Major (B.S. - all emphases)

Point Forward proposed discontinuing all emphases within the Geoscience (B.S.) major and the Geography (B.S.) major. Point Forward included these majors separately, but the Committee found that the majors were so interconnected that it was clearer to address them together. The Committee evaluated the proposed elimination based on criteria set forth in Point Forward and UWSP RPD 20-24 policy (Table 5).

After reviewing the evidence, the Committee voted unanimously against the motion to discontinue the Bachelor of Science degree programs in Geography and Geoscience (0-11-0). This decision was reached based on the following:

1. The Committee unanimously agreed that Point Forward failed to provide the requisite educational, programmatic, or financial evidence, as detailed in UWSP's RPD 20-24 policy, to support the elimination of degree granting programs in Geography and Geoscience. Specifically,
 - Point Forward did not provide evidence that terminating these programs would enhance the educational mission of the university (educational consideration).
 - Point Forward did not include results of an analysis exploring the potential impact termination would have on other academic programs, departments, or colleges (programmatic consideration)
 - Point Forward did not provide results from benefit-cost, financial impact, or cost minimization analyses to justify program termination (financial consideration).

Table 5. Compliance matrix for discontinuation of the Bachelor of Science degrees in Geography and Geoscience based on criteria set forth in Point Forward and UWSP RPD 20-24.

Academic Program	Point Forward Criteria*					RPD 20-24 Criteria**		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
Geoscience	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Geography	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
* Point Forward Criteria (Point Forward, page 7) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current enrollment 2. Ability to attract new students 3. Retention 4. Student Credit Hour (SCH) generated 5. Cost per SCH ** RPD 20-24 Criteria (UWSP 5.04, Section C) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educational considerations 2. Programmatic considerations. 3. Financial considerations 								

2. The lack of data for enrollment, retention, SCH generation, and cost per SCH for all programs on campus compromised the Committee's ability to make meaningful comparisons between the programs targeted for discontinuation and those that would be retained. Additionally, the lack of information regarding the source

of the data presented in Point Forward and the methodologies associated with calculated values created doubt as to the reliability of the evidence offered in Point Forward.

3. The Committee found that the Chancellor's proposal to terminate the degree programs in Geography and Geoscience addressed all five of the program elimination criteria outlined in Point Forward. However, the Committee found the data provided in Point Forward misleading with respect to enrollment trends (Table 6).

Table 6. Five-year enrollment for emphases in Geography and Geoscience as reported in Point Forward.

Program/Major	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Geography: GIS-Cartography	23	17	22	24	10
Geography: Human Geography	13	14	10	7	1
Geography: Physical Geography	3	7	5	3	
Geography: Physical Environment	13	12	5		
Geography	1	2		7	14
Geography: Urban Planning	10	8	6	4	
Geoscience: Biogeoscience	9	8	5	2	3
Geoscience: Earth Materials	6	5	2	1	
Geoscience: Earth Sys Sci	1	1			
Geoscience	7	8	10	28	30
Geoscience: Environmental Analysis	21	20	16	9	2
Geoscience: Hydrogeology	12	10	13	3	2

- **Enrollment:** As a result of the Administration's Program Prioritization initiative which began in 2014, all Geoscience emphases were eliminated in the fall of 2015. The declines in enrollment for Geoscience, as reported in Point Forward, simply reflect the expected reduction in students within programs that were already phased out by the Department to achieve greater efficiency.
 - Point Forward fails to account for the number of students declaring a minor in Geography/Geology.
 - Faculty report the Department's enrollments were negatively impacted by the General Education Program (GEP) changes that reduced required science credits from 5 to 3; however, the Department still offers 23 courses that fulfill GEP requirements, generating 2,500-4,500 SCH in GEP courses each semester (Appendix L).
4. The Committee noted the data provided in Point Forward regarding student retention (Table 7) rates did not align with data reported by the department per the Office of the Registrar (Table 8).

Table 7. Four-year (2012-16) retention rates for Geoscience and Geography as reported in Point Forward.

Major	Number of Initial Students	Students Retained to Second Year at the University	Students Retained to Second Year in Initial Major	Retention Rate to Year 2 at the University	Retention Rate to Year 2 in Initial Major	Retention Rate to Year 3 in University	Retention Rate to Year 3 in Initial Major
Geoscience (BS)	19	15	9	79%	47%	58%	32%
Geography (BS)	7	2	2	29%	29%	14%	14%

Table 8. Enrollment and retention trends (2008-16) for Geography and Geoscience (*source:* Data supplied by UWSP Registration and Records Office as included in the Department’s response letter – Appendix L).

<i>Description of Enrollment Category</i>	<i>Geography</i>	<i>Geoscience</i>
<i>Total number of students enrolled in major since the Fall of 2008</i>	<i>187</i>	<i>142</i>
<i>Total number of students who have graduated or are still enrolled</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>110</i>
<i>Total number of students who left major or withdrew from University</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Total number of students who enrolled in major as a first-year student</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Total number of first-year students who returned for sophomore year</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>26</i>

- Per the Department of Geography and Geology, graduation rates for declared majors are substantially higher than the UWSP average.
 - 72% of Geoscience Majors who have declared since Fall 2008 have graduated in the major (10% switch majors, 18% withdraw)
 - 70% of Geography Majors who have declared since Fall 2008 have graduated in the major (6% switch, 24% withdraw)
5. The Committee noted that the SCH data presented in Point Forward (Table 9) did not align with data from OIRE (Table 10). The Committee also recognized that the differences were small (4%, relative to the OIRE data).
- Per the Geography and Geology Department, the reduction in SCH can partially be attributed to a 2013 change from 6 credits to 3 credits in the GEP science requirements. The consequence of this change was a decrease in enrollment in introductory, 5-credit course offerings.

Table 9. Five-year (2013-1018) SCH production for Geography and Geology as presented in Point Forward.

Prefix and Level	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
GEOG - Total	7622	6843	6290	5770	5780
Graduate	33	21	97	99	15
Lower Division	5723	5297	4760	4179	4671
Upper Division	1866	1525	1433	1492	1094
GEOL - Total	1319	1373	1259	977	1009
Lower Division	922	875	862	703	657
Upper Division	397	498	397	274	352

Table 10. Total number of students enrolled and associated SCH production from 2014 through 2018 for Geography and Geoscience courses (*source:* OIRE, Annual Student Credit Hour (SCH) by Department).

SOURCE	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	# STUDENTS	SCH	# STUDENTS	SCH	# STUDENTS	SCH	# STUDENTS	SCH
Total	2717	8357	2596	7855	2246	6756	2361	7083
GEOG	2310	6976	2232	6596	1961	5779	2055	6026
GEOL	407	1381	364	1259	285	977	306	1057

6. The Committee concluded the data provided in Point Forward regarding cost per SCH and the total cost of education for these degree options were not reliable (Table 11) owing to unidentified sources of information and unspecified methods of calculation.

- **Internships:** The Department stated there are 40-50 students conducting internships per year and there are more internships available than there are students. According to the Huron report, the cost per SCH of an internship in Geography, GEOG 480, is \$1,452. The additional costs are due to an overhead calculation. It is unclear how Huron calculated \$924,093 for internships when faculty do not receive compensation for internships (Table 12).

Table 11. Cost per Student Credit Hour (SCH) and total cost of education for Bachelor of Science degrees in Geography and Geoscience as reported in Point Forward.

Program	Department	College	Total Credit Needed	Average Major Credit	Average Major Courses Cost per SCH	Total Cost of Education
Geoscience, BS	Geography and Geology	COLS	120	59	\$235	\$25,642
Geography, BS	Geography and Geology	COLS	120	52	\$231	\$25,402

Table 12. SCH of Geography Internship (*source:* Huron Report, line 9467 from the “Program Build Out Class” spreadsheet in the “Cost to Education Final Model” document).

Description	Units	Total Cost for Class	SCH Produced	Raw Average	Total Per SCH Produced	Total Cost
Internship in Geography	12	\$75,504	52	\$ 1,452.00	\$ 77,008	\$ 924,093.01

7. The Committee found Point Forward lacking in its assessment of the impact that termination will have on other programs, departments, and colleges.

- **Teacher Education:** Elimination of geography courses will greatly affect teacher education in broad field science. Geography 100/105 are required by the state of Wisconsin for teacher certification, so if these courses are not offered or offerings are limited, education students may not get the seats that they need, potentially delaying time to degree or causing students to transfer elsewhere.
- **Impact:** There is an interconnectedness of courses and minors to other programs on campus. All but two majors and two minors within the College of Natural Resources (CNR) require courses in Geography and/or Geology. The Geographic Information Systems (GIS) minor is specifically paired with CNR and Computer and New Media Technologies (CNMT) programs, so elimination or reduction of course offerings would impact these majors. There is also a need for GIS course work and/or a minor in a wide array of entry level jobs.

- Certification Program: GIS certificates would be affected if Geoscience and Geography is eliminated because the required coursework for the certificate is offered through the Department. According to the Department, GIS Centers on other campuses have failed without a departmental infrastructure.
8. The Committee noted that Point Forward failed to demonstrate the financial benefits associated with terminating these programs.
 9. The Committee concluded that discontinuing the degree offerings in Geography and Geoscience would not enhance the educational mission of the university.

The decision to discontinue the program does not appear to be a pedagogically sound or strategic move. Point Forward proposes that UWSP's educational mission moving forward will be to focus on professional degree programs. Point Forward also states that Geography/Geology are professional degree programs. According to OIRE-provided Burning Glass data, the market demand for people with this degree is increasing (Appendix L). The combination of these points does not clearly articulate the logic of selecting this program for elimination or the benefit to the educational mission of the university.

History – all emphases within the History (B.A. and B.S.) major

Point Forward proposed discontinuing all emphases within the History (B.A. and B.S.) major. The Committee evaluated the proposed elimination based on criteria set forth in Point Forward and UWSP RPD 20-24 policy (Table 13).

After reviewing the evidence, the Committee voted unanimously against the motion to discontinue all emphases within the History (B.A. and B.S.) major (0-11-0). This decision was reached based on the following:

1. The Committee unanimously agreed that Point Forward failed to provide the requisite educational, programmatic, or financial evidence, as detailed in UWSP RPD 20-24 policy, to support the elimination of all emphases within the History (B.A. and B.S.) major. Specifically,
 - Point Forward did not provide evidence that terminating these programs would enhance the educational mission of the university (educational consideration).
 - Point Forward did not include results of an analysis exploring the potential impact termination would have on other academic programs, departments, or colleges (programmatic consideration).
 - Point Forward did not provide results from benefit-cost, financial impact, or cost minimization analyses to justify program termination (financial consideration).

Table 13. Compliance matrix for discontinuation of all emphases within the History (B.A. and B.S.) major based on criteria set forth in Point Forward and UWSP RPD 20-24.

Academic Program	Point Forward Criteria*					RPD 20-24 Criteria**		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3
History	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
<p>* <i>Point Forward Criteria (Point Forward, page 7)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Current enrollment</i> 2. <i>Ability to attract new students</i> 3. <i>Retention</i> 4. <i>Student Credit Hour (SCH) generated</i> 5. <i>Cost per SCH</i> <p>** <i>RPD 20-24 Criteria (UWSP 5.04, Section C)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Educational considerations</i> 2. <i>Programmatic considerations.</i> 3. <i>Financial considerations</i> 								

2. The lack of data for enrollment, retention, SCH generation, and cost per SCH for all programs on campus compromised the Committee's ability to make meaningful comparisons between the programs that would be retained, and the History program targeted for discontinuation. Additionally, the lack of information regarding the source of the data and the methodologies associated with calculated values created doubt as to the reliability of the evidence offered in Point Forward.
3. The Committee found that the rationale to terminate the History program did not uniformly address the evaluation criteria set forth in Point Forward. Specifically, the proposal failed to provide evidence detailing student retention rates.
4. The Committee found that the enrollment/recruitment data provided in Point Forward, while generally accurate, were frequently misleading, incomplete, or lacking the proper context. The examples below illustrate some of the problems with the data used to justify elimination of the History major.
 - Comparative data: While the enrollment data for History seem to be generally accurate, conclusions drawn from the data appear to be misleading because proper context was not provided. For example, Point Forward asserts that a 48% drop in majors over the last five years justifies eliminating the History major, but OIRE statistics show other programs not targeted for elimination with equal (Economics 48%) or greater (Chemistry 51%) declines in majors over the same time period (Appendix M).
 - Overall enrollment: Point Forward describes History a "low enrolled major" as justification for its elimination, however, it is not clear what constitutes "low" enrollment. This label appears to be problematic when one compares History to other UWSP programs that have fewer majors but are not on the list for discontinuance. Since 2017, enrollment in the History (B.A. and B.S.) major is up 37% (Table 14).

Table 14: Enrollment trends (2013-2018) for degree programs offered by the UWSP Department of History and International Studies.

Major	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
History, B.A. and B.S.	146	124	116	114	76	120
History: Race and Ethnicity	1	2	2	1	1	2
International Studies	95	77	64	67	68	72
Broad-field Social Science	163	110	117	115	78	105
Total (not headcount)	405	313	299	297	223	299

Source: UWSP Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Fall End-of-Term counts of declared Academic Plans; UWSP OIRE, Student Plans Fall 2018, major-minor count. The fall 2018 counts were provided to the department by OIRE on December 5, 2018.

- Upper-level Courses: Point Forward cites “small enrollments in upper-level courses” as a reason for discontinuance. The Department, however, provided data from accesSPoint (the university’s student information system) showing that the fill rate for upper-division classes was 95% in 2018 (Table 15).

Table 15: Fill rate for upper-level History courses (Fall 2018).

In spring 2018, enrollment averaged 23.3 students in upper-level courses offered on the Stevens Point campus.

Subject	Catalog	Course Title	Capacity	Enrolled Students
HIST	300	Methods and Skills of History	21	21
HIST	305	The History of Astronomy	25	25
HIST	313	History of Islam	25	25
HIST	318	Image of the Samurai	25	34
HIST	348	The Modern Caribbean	25	15
HIST	356	The Renaissance	25	24
HIST	361	France: Enlightenment, Revolution, and Napoleon	25	24
HIST	384	Women’s Rights and Feminism	25	23
HIST	388	The Civil War Era	25	23
HIST	395	Material Cultures	25	18
HIST/INTL	480/490	International History	21	23

Source: AccesSPoint. Open-Closed List by Term. Spring 2018.

- The Committee found the data provided in Point Forward regarding SCH generation were misleading because reductions in staffing were not considered.
 - Merger and SCH production: Per the History Department’s response (Appendix M) to Point Forward, the Department lost full-time equivalent (FTE) on the UWSP main campus, but gained FTE through the merger with the Wausau and Marshfield campuses. Since 2013, the Department FTE declined at a higher rate (-25%) than their SCH (-15%). Lastly, Department FTE further declined due to an additional VSIP in 2018.
- The Committee found the data in Point Forward regarding cost per SCH and the total cost of education for these degree options were not accurate owing to changes in staffing and consolidation of program offerings.

In addition, though the data may seem accurate on its surface, the interpreted conclusions drawn can be viewed as inaccurate when put into proper context.

- Cost: The figures in Point Forward for the cost to educate are inaccurate because they include uncompensated oversight of independent studies. For example, the cost per SCH listed in the Huron data is over \$11,000 for History 480—Museum Internship (Table 16); this is highly inaccurate. Internships appear to demonstrate low enrollment because they are individual studies overseen by a faculty member outside of the normal teaching load for no additional pay; this suggests problems with the Huron method of calculation. In reality, History 480 generates net income for the university, because students pay tuition for a course that the university does not pay faculty to teach.

Table 16: Cost to educate for Museum Internship (*source:* Huron Data).

<u>Course</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>Total SCH Produced</u>	<u>Salary per SCH Produced</u>	<u>Total Overhead per SCH Produced</u>	<u>Financial Aid per SCH Produced</u>	<u>Total Cost per SCH Produced</u>
HIST 480	\$11,461.72	1	\$11,416.53	\$39.50	\$5.68	\$11,461.72

- The Committee found Point Forward lacking in its assessment of the impact that termination will have on other programs, departments, and colleges, as well as the mission of the university. The examples below illustrate how the proposed elimination of the program has indirect and unexamined impacts on programs retained.
 - General Education Program (GEP): History provides a significant number of courses in many GEP categories: Global Awareness, Environmental Responsibility, US Diversity, as well as Historical Perspectives. These courses often serve both the major and the GEP because they reflect a specialized area of knowledge, which might become unavailable if additional faculty are lost.
 - Teacher Education: There is likely to be an impact on teacher education if offerings in History are decreased and the major is eliminated, since most students coming to UWSP with an intent to teach are aware of what History means, but not Broadfield Social Science. In addition, there are students who transfer to History out of the Broadfield Social Science major when they realize that they don't wish to pursue teaching certification. Therefore, eliminating the History major will negatively impact student recruitment and retention at UWSP: prospective students interested in teaching will go elsewhere to become licensed teachers and declared Broadfield Social Science students will transfer to other campuses when they want to change their major to History.
- The Committee noted that Point Forward failed to demonstrate the financial benefits associated with terminating these programs. The examples below illustrate the limitations of the Point Forward proposal's budgetary logic as a solution to an economic problem.

- Budget: Eliminating a low-cost major, like History, does not contribute significantly to alleviating the structural deficit.
- Cost: The revenue from the History major exceeds the cost to educate. Almost half of UWSP majors cost more to run than what History brings in on the revenue side. Eliminating a revenue-generating program may increase rather than alleviate the structural deficit.

8. The Committee concluded that discontinuing the History major did not enhance the educational mission of the university.

- Access – As a regional university, not offering a History program reinforces inequality. Recent research shows that History majors are thriving at elite institutions, but our students often don't have the ability to afford or access these institutions by moving further away from their home regions or to other states. Eliminating the History program therefore potentially reduces enrollment at UWSP and negatively impacts equal access to educational opportunities in Central Wisconsin.
- Teacher Education: The Teacher Education program will be undermined by the loss of the History major in the following ways: 1) History is a recognizable major, attracting those with specific interests in the teaching field; Broadfield Social Studies is not readily understood by students, limiting recruitment opportunities. Being able to add a History major to Broadfield certification also makes graduates more marketable. 2) Eliminating the History major means that although enough classes might be offered to fulfill minimum requirements, the depth of preparation is likely to be impacted because the range of specialized options will be significantly reduced. Because of UWSP's history as the state's normal school and the current service it provides in supplying teachers to the regions school districts, teacher education is central to UWSP's mission; endangering a program that serves teacher education, therefore, does not enhance the educational mission of the university.

The decision to discontinue the program does not appear to be a pedagogically sound or strategic move. It is not well understood why this program was considered a low-enrolled major when current numbers indicate program growth. The impact discontinuance will have on teacher education and potential student recruitment contradicts the educational mission of the university. The combination of these points does not clearly articulate the logic of selecting this program for elimination or the benefit to the educational mission of the university.

French and German Majors

On December 20, 2018, Chancellor Patterson issued a statement that the proposal to invoke RPD 20-24 for both the French and German majors was no longer needed, and so the French and German majors were removed from the list of potential programs to be eliminated (Appendix P).

Concluding Comments and Recommendations

Overall, the evidence provided by Point Forward fails to justify the discontinuance of programs at UWSP according to the criteria outlined in RPD 20-24, namely:

1. For “*educational considerations [that] may include strategic institutional planning considerations such as long-term student and market demand and societal needs.*” Point Forward does not present any data related to long-term trends in student or market demand for the programs it deems worthy of discontinuance, nor does it provide evidence of regional trends that suggest these programs no longer attend to any “societal needs.”
2. To reallocate “*resources to other programs with higher priority based on educational considerations. Such long-range judgments generally will involve the analysis of financial resources and the needs, value and quality of the program and any related college or school.*” Point Forward again provides no data to support the contention that the programs slated for discontinuance are of lesser value, quality, or need than other programs that are retained.

Departments and deans, however, provided evidence refuting program discontinuance according to the criteria that RPD 20-24 states should be used. In evaluating all the evidence provided, the Committee identified the following principal findings related to our concluding recommendations for each program in question in Point Forward.

ART 2D/3D B.F.A. Principal Findings

1. The College of Fine Arts and Communication Dean stated that the current number of Art faculty will allow the new School of Design to fulfill its educational mission, however any further loss of Art faculty puts into question the envisioned success of the new School of Design.
2. The B.F.A. degree option draws students to UWSP.
3. The additional courses required for a B.F.A. in Studio Art compared to a B.A. in Art are required electives for other majors (e.g., Graphic Design, Interior Architecture) and thus a B.F.A. in Studio Art supports other majors, namely those that are identified as areas of growth and part of the new School of Design. Given the need for these courses by other programs, it seems clear that it would not cost anymore to retain a B.F.A. in Studio Art, and the Committee sees no reason to eliminate it.
4. Without a B.F.A. in Studio Art, UWSP will lose the prestige of being one of only two Wisconsin schools with all four areas of Art accredited by NASAD.

Recommendation for Art: Rather than eliminate the 2D and 3D Art B.F.A. degrees, combine them into a single B.F.A. in Studio Art.

GEOGRAPHY/GEOLOGY Principal Findings

1. GIS certificates, an area with demonstrated success at UWSP, and GI Science, an area of growth named by the Administration as a future possible program, cannot exist without foundation courses in Geography. As a result, continuing to offer the Geography major would not require costs above what is needed to support the professional GIS and possible GI Science programs that align with the societal

needs and institutional values. Reducing Geography faculty would compromise the Department's ability to cover the GIS and GI Science programs.

2. The current GIS certificates add value to many majors (particularly in Natural Resources) and provide essential continuing education to professionals.
3. Reduction in Geography faculty will reduce Geography offerings that serve the GEP and that are required in several majors, including Early Childhood Education and Natural Science Teacher Education majors who would need to complete their degrees elsewhere to be licensed teachers.
4. Not only is Geography a low-cost program, but it generates significant revenue via the internship course.
5. Enrollments have not declined more than other majors being retained.
6. The employment potential for graduates is high, as evidenced by the large number of internships relative to students.

Recommendation for Geography: Retain the Geography B.S. to serve the needs of the GEP, several majors, the successful GIS certificates, as well as the new program Administration has expressed support for, GI Science.

HISTORY Principal Findings

1. One of the most strongly held values by the university is a robust General Education Program. This has been evidenced over the past several years by upper administrators repeatedly expressing this value publicly as well as their prioritizing resources toward creating a new University College to give the GEP a Dean-level champion on campus and the new Wisconsin Idea Institute. Recently, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) required more precisely defined instructor qualifications to teach GEP courses. As a group, History faculty are uniquely positioned to ensure continuity and quality of the GEP during the university's restructuring because they meet HLC qualifications to teach courses in four GEP areas. Reducing the number of History faculty at this time would compromise the university's ability to meet its educational mission and uphold one of its most strongly held values.
2. Not only is the History major low cost, the program is revenue generating. Eliminating it is counterproductive to effectively addressing the university's financial crisis.
3. Enrollments have not declined more than other majors being retained and in fact in the last year have experienced an uptick.
4. The School of Education (SoE) values the History major for effectively recruiting and retaining teaching intent students. For students interested in teaching social sciences, SoE advisers recommend specifically the History major due to its higher employment potential.

Recommendation for History: Retain the History major to contribute revenue to the Institution and serve the teacher preparation needs of the region, the GEP, and overall educational mission of the university.

The Committee's recommendations were also based on the following inadequacies of the Point Forward proposal.

1. Discrepancies between the data provided in Point Forward and data provided from other sources.
2. Current information from departments was excluded in Point Forward.
3. Outdated information was included in Point Forward.

4. Point Forward did not include projected data for savings, revenues, or lost enrollments due to cuts, making it difficult to assess future budgetary savings.
5. Proposed elimination of these programs has indirect and unexamined impacts on other programs, including those Point Forward proposes to enhance.
6. Budgetary impact of eliminating these programs is minimal and may have negative fiscal consequences by harming programs, such as teacher education, that bring students to campus.
7. The impact of proposing to eliminate these programs has already damaged the reputation of the university; actual elimination would exacerbate these problems and impede the educational mission of the institution.
8. The lack of comparative programmatic information made it impossible to determine why only these specific programs were targeted for elimination and inhibited the Committee's ability to fully consider the proposal.
9. Point Forward does not address the structural deficit.
10. The burden of proof lies primarily with the proposer, but the depth of support required for such a serious and consequential proposal as Point Forward was not provided.

Data Concerns

The biggest issue the Committee faced was inconsistent data, which made comparisons and rational justifications difficult. Lack of collaboration on part of the Administration did not help. When the Committee requested certain data, it was directed to use the OIRE website. Due to the website's complexity, the extraction of specific data points required an inordinate amount of precious time taken away from an already tight three-month schedule. Nonetheless, the Committee did its best to collect and analyze the data. The following are examples of problems we encountered:

- 1) Data for 2018 were not presented.
- 2) Data in the OIRE site and in Point Forward often did not align.
- 3) How the data were aggregated in Point Forward was unclear. The method(s) of calculation, particularly the approaches to cost analysis, were not clear, and therefore, could not be confirmed by the Committee.
- 4) Since no sources were provided in Point Forward to indicate where the data were coming from, the information was unverifiable.

Impact

The Committee is concerned that the proposed reduction of course offerings in these disciplines might prevent students from meeting the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction requirements or create bottlenecks that will slow down students' progress toward graduation. Current students may be tempted to transfer to a different institution, while prospective students may find the lack of a major in the areas for which they seek certification undesirable.

Structural Deficit

One of the major flaws of Point Forward is that it does not represent a viable solution to UWSP's projected structural deficit. The Administration estimates that over the next three years the university is facing an \$8 million structural deficit. However, eliminating low-cost majors will not do much, if anything, to solve this

problem. As outlined in this report, some of the programs targeted for elimination are revenue-generating; their elimination, rather than alleviate the deficit, would likely make it worse.

Application of RPD 20-24

The RPD 20-24 policy was approved with the understanding that it would serve as a guide to a committee such as this one. One of the definitions in the policy states: “For the purposes of this policy, ‘educational considerations’ shall not include cyclical or temporary variations in enrollment. Educational considerations must reflect long-range judgements that the educational mission of the institution as a whole will be enhanced by a program’s discontinuance.” (UWSP 5.02, D).

Educational mission

Point Forward states that the educational focus for moving forward should be on professional degree programs where the GEP is fully integrated. The emphasis on professional degree programs is a shift away from our current educational mission (Appendix J).

Burden of proof

According to Section 5.04, part C, in RPD 20-24; *“A proposal to discontinue a program due to educational considerations that will result in faculty layoff may be initiated by faculty in the program, faculty in the college or school that contains the program, the faculty council, the dean, the provost, or the chancellor. The proposal shall be in writing and shall contain appropriate information and analysis regarding the education considerations, including programmatic and financial considerations, supporting the proposed program discontinuance.”*

The intent of the above language reflects the serious nature and consequences, intended and unintended, associated with a call for a programs’ discontinuance. As such, the language is particularly clear and unambiguous (i.e. shall) in stating that the burden of educational, programmatic, and financial proof to support the call for discontinuance lies with the initiating party. In reviewing the call for program discontinuance in Point Forward, it was abundantly clear to the Committee that the evidence, as previously demonstrated, was incomplete and inconsistent. Perhaps of greater consequence was the omission of the mandated analysis of the impact of a program’s discontinuance on other programs, departments, and colleges within the university. In accordance with RPD 20-24, the Committee believes all future calls for program discontinuation must provide evidence and documentation that is strictly and unequivocally compliant with RPD 20-24.

Misuse of policy

In addition, the rationale for choosing to eliminate these programs when there are other low-enrolled majors on campus is unclear. The Huron data, for example, show History and Geography/Geology are less costly than other programs on our campus that are not slated for elimination. This raised the question of whether the Administration was misusing RPD 20-24 as a mechanism for terminating tenured faculty rather than for the purpose of discontinuing a program for educational considerations. RPD 20-24 should not be used to remedy administrative mistakes made in the past that have resulted in financial problems.

Legal Opinion

The Committee was also made aware of a legal analysis of RPD 20-24 brought forth by the Stevens Point Academic Representation Council (SPARC). The opinion was authored by counsel hired by the American Federation of Teachers-Wisconsin (AFT-W). The document addressed the status of tenured faculty hired before the enactment of RPD 20-24. The committee considered the legal opinion as an item for information only and took no action (Appendix O).

Process and Concluding Remarks

The Committee focused its work on gathering and evaluating quantitative and qualitative data in a systematic and balanced process over the past three months. The data the Committee received from departments provided a contrasting picture on the impact of the proposed program discontinuations from what was expressed in Point Forward.

The Committee's charge was to review and evaluate any proposal to discontinue a program that would lead to the layoff of tenured faculty. While the Committee was informed at the end of our three-month timeline that 20-24 would no longer be required for the layoff of tenured faculty members in the targeted programs included in Point Forward, the work the Committee produced was requested by the Chancellor to provide input regarding program eliminations and to inform the process going forward.

While the committee fully recognizes UWSP's financial predicament and appreciates the need to cut costs in a prudent and responsible manner, the Committee found no financial, educational, or programmatic justification for the elimination of those programs identified in Point Forward.

Finally, while this process was often challenging, the Committee found that the challenges were made easier by the productive collaboration with and dedicated work of our colleagues. The Committee took this responsibility seriously and looks forward to the exploration and serious consideration of our recommendations.

Committee Recommendations to the Board of Regents

RPD 20-24 – Process

As the first RPD 20-24 Consultative Committee to be convened in the UW System, the Committee has the following recommendations for the Board of Regents to consider:

- **Program vs. Programs issue** – While legally “program” may stipulate the review of more than one program within a three-month time frame, this does not mean it is a sound policy, especially if there are multiple programs to be reviewed. We recommend the Board of Regents make a modification to the policy.
- **Information request** – We recommend that the policy stipulate that information or data requests from the Consultative Committee be responded to within a reasonable timeframe (48 hours) of said request.
- **UW System Legal** – We recommend that any future Consultative Committees have direct access to UW System Legal and not be required to go through an administrative liaison. This will expedite the process.
- **Deliberation process** – It was unclear in RPD 20-24 that affected departments be included in the deliberation process. We recommend an addition to the policy that clearly states this.
- **Legal opinion** – AFT-W Legal Opinion – The committee was made aware of a legal analysis of RPD 20-24 authored by counsel hired by ATF-Wisconsin. The document researched the status of tenured faculty hired before the enactment of RPD 20-24. The committee considered the legal opinion as an item for information only and took no action (Appendix O).
- **Huron data** (or other information from hired consulting firms) – This was the first-time data from a consulting firm were used in a policy context. The Consultative Committee did not see the report prepared by Huron. We received a summary of the report that was generated by the Associate Vice Chancellor of Budget, Personnel, and Grants. Unfortunately, the summary report failed to detail the source(s) of information or the methodologies associated with the assessment process. These violations of the scientific method are completely and professionally unacceptable and call into question the integrity of the proposing party.
- **Process** - Our process was guided first and foremost by the letter of the policy, UWSP Handbook Chapter 5: PROCEDURES RELATING TO FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REQUIRING FACULTY LAYOFF. It states, “The Consultative Committee shall request and review comments and recommendations on the proposed program discontinuance from faculty and academic and university staff in the program, faculty and academic and university staff in the affected college or school, students in the program, and other appropriate institutional bodies or individuals.” (section 5.04 F). To that end, the Committee met with deans, unit chairs, faculty and staff from each affected program, and in one case with a representative of the School of Education to inform us about the possible impacts of program discontinuation on UWSP’s teacher education programs. Each program was invited to provide current and historical data on the considerations stated in UWSP 5.04 section E that our Committee was charged to review and evaluate. Our systematic and balanced process over the past 3 months gathered a wealth of quantitative and qualitative data that was not considered in shaping the rationales expressed in Point Forward. These data from departments provided a contrasting picture on the impact of the proposed program discontinuations. The Committee wishes to impress upon the UW System community that our systematic and inclusive process efficiently gathered and evaluated more evidence

about several degree programs than what was used to craft Point Forward. We hope the resulting documentation of our meetings will provide a model for collaboratively assessing the programmatic array of an institution for the purpose of identifying changes needed to advance the institution forward in a more thorough and cooperative way.